/115 cont./

774
822

admitting that Sebastião, in the capacity of ñanderú, is more competent. Poýdjú, who claims to have become one who prays after he became old, spontaneously confesses, by the way, his ignorance in many things concerning religious doctrine. Many others, principally men of middle age, declare themselves incompetent in matters of theology and religion.

774
[192]

Ayvú properly means language; sometimes one also hears someone say ñeẽ, speech. The ayvú -- or the several ayvú, as the case may be -- is of divine origin, that is, it shares the nature of the supernatural spirits. It is responsible for the desires, feelings, and the noblest manifestations of the individual.

[191]
774
824
156

The basic, primordial function of the soul is to confer upon man the gift of language; thus the designation. It is an interesting fact because of showing that the idea of interhuman communication is placed first, in consonance, by the way, with the philosophy of life, characteristic of tribal societies, that looks at the human being above all as a social animal, as a fragment of the group. The individual has value socially to the extent that he is part of the community and communicates with his comrades. Furthermore, the Ñandéva "psychologist" tries to explain the play of individual inclinations and tendencies. Just as in this play /116/ distinct and sometimes contradictory traits can be isolated, nothing is more natural than to consider the soul divided up into several component units.

774

The atsýyguá, constituting primarily the basis of biological existence and of the hormic manifestations, always corresponds to the nature or disposition of some animal; it therefore represents the animal character of the person or, as I have also heard said, the "incarnate genius." Perhaps in this case the psychologists of the Western world would use the term temperament or what has come to correspond to it in modern times. Good and peaceable fellow-tribesmen have the atsýyguá of a butterfly, a hummingbird,

[828]
[825]

/118 cont./

What is /119/ presented in these pages is that of the village of Rio Branco, collected principally from the lips of my friend Capitão Francisco, who, although he does not use the title ñanderú, is a family chief with an active and intense religious life.

For the Mbüá, according to the source indicated, the human being is divided into txeretẽ ("my body") and txeñeẽ (my spirit, or in literal translation, "my tongue" or "speech"). In spite of this summary designation for the soul, there is the idea of plurality, in consequence, we might say, of an attempt at analytical comprehension of txeñeẽ from the point of view of its qualities and inclinations. In contrast to what is given for the Ñandéva, the biotic tendencies of man do not constitute an "animal" soul of the individual for the Mbüá, as Cadogan also observed in the group studied by him (12).

12. /From p. 151 of the original source./ Cadogan, 1952, p. 33.

The Mbüá (Rio Branco) admit the existence of three souls in each individual, two good ones and one bad one, which are manifested through communication, that is, by means of language and a process that we might call comparable to telepathy. The bad soul and one of the good ones produce good representations or manifestations relative to other persons, who may be found in the vicinity as well as at great distances. It is therefore a matter of the person in his relations with other human beings. The third human soul, a kind of protector spirit, has charge of the individual's safety, for example, keeping watch over him when he is asleep alone in the forest. It is not, as it might appear, a being distinct from the man, as the Christian Guardian Angel is, but an integral part of his person (somewhat like the demon of Plato) and is likewise called ñeẽ. It is even the first of the three souls sent by God, like, say, the initial nucleus of the personality.

3: Watson E-4,5 (1943) 1952 SM4 Guarani SM4

*178 476 the various extended families that comprised a settlement.[148] The *puǰirão* afforded pleasure and the solidarity of assisting, as well as the assurance that when the participants in turn wanted help, it would be forthcoming. But

> The *muchirão* [*puǰirão*] is not properly aid, an act of salvation, or a mission of mercy; it is rather a gesture of friendship, an excuse for a let-up of one's labors, a very attractive form of cooperation [not "cooperation" in our definition here] in order to accomplish rapidly a piece of agricultural work.[149]

Today there is something less than universal agreement about the merits of the *puǰirão* and something less then total participation by all individuals in the village.[150] Some individuals say that *puǰirão* work is not good and that they prefer to do their own work; then at least they will have it well done, though it necessarily takes more time. Others say that the *puǰirão* "costs too much," referring primarily to the corn or other ingredients necessary to make the *cāuī'*, which is traditionally served to those who help. Today, also, it is partly the prestige derived by those who give big drinking fest-dances and provide [574] their fellows large quantities of *cāuī'* that keeps the *puǰirão* alive. However, this is not to suggest that the *puǰirão* is a heavy burden in all respects. Some persons who have frequent recourse to the *puǰirão* for work manage very well economically, have large *kokué*, and are not handicapped in doing their outside [527] *changa* work for Brazilian *patrões*. Some can afford to be the hosts at large, all-village dances and drinking fests on Saturday nights, and in this activity they vie with each other to serve more *cāuī'* to their fellow villagers than ever before.[151] Nor is the large-scale *puǰirão* the only type; small work parties without village-wide drinking fests are very frequent. In other words, in the purely economic sense, the *puǰirão* apparently works well for some individuals, while for others it works only moderately well. Still others never give *puǰirão*.

Following Mead's distinction, participation in the *puǰirão*, while certainly collective, is not cooperation but rather only helpfulness. The distinction is

[191]

[19]

[148] Possibly this function is somehow reminiscent of the *"grupos de trabalho"* (work groups) which Baldus (1937, pp. 86–112) has recognized among the Tapirapé.

[149] Ayrosa, quoted in Baldus and Willems, 1939, p. 157. The varying orthography of the word *puǰirão-muchirão* is probably to be explained on the basis of the Tupi-Guarani consonant "mb" of many dialects. Also, of course, this word itself varied in other respects from one dialect to another.

[150] It is true, of course, that the *puǰirão* may also previously have had some of the character of the optional; the facts are unknown. Perhaps the difference on this point, if any, between the past and the present is one of degree and not of kind.

[151] Hence, perhaps the enormous wooden trough for *cāuī'*, mentioned supra, p. 30. There [273] is probably some relation of this vieing to give large drinking fests and the increased agricultural [433] surplus that has become more and more evident with the expansion of agriculture since aboriginal times. The manufacture of *cāuī'* is, after all, based largely upon agriculture, since *kokué* crops are the ingredients now used—corn, potatoes, manioc, in that order of importance. An agricultural increase might thus favorably affect the consumption of *cāuī'*.